

Timothy J. Conway, OSB No. 851752 (Lead Attorney)  
Direct Dial: (503) 802-2027  
Facsimile: (503) 972-3727  
Email: tim.conway@tonkon.com

Ava L. Schoen, OSB No. 044072  
Direct Dial: (503) 802-2143  
Facsimile: (503) 972-3843  
Email: ava.schoen@tonkon.com  
**TONKON TORP LLP**

**TONKON TORP LLP**  
888 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 160  
Portland, OR 97204-2099

Attorneys for Debtor B. & J. Property Investments, Inc.

Nicholas J. Henderson, OSB No. 074027  
Email: nhenderson@portlaw.com  
MOTSCHENBACHER & BLATTNER, LL  
117 SW Taylor Street, Suite 300  
Portland, OR 97204  
Telephone: (503) 417-0508  
Facsimile: (503) 417-0528

Of Attorneys for William J. Berman

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

DISTRICT OF OREGON

In re  
B. & J. Property Investments, Inc.

Case No. 19-60138-pcm11  
**LEAD CASE**

Jointly Administered With  
Case No. 19-60230-pcm11

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF  
CONFIRMATION OF DEBTORS'  
PLAN OF REORGANIZATION AND  
NOTICE OF PLAN MODIFICATION**

In re  
William J. Berman,

**Debtor.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

25 B. & J. Property Investments, Inc. ("B&J") and William J. Berman  
26 ("Berman") (collectively, "Debtors") submit this memorandum in support of confirmation of

1      their Joint Plan of Reorganization (the “Plan”) and provide notice of Plan modification as to  
2      Class 6, as set forth below.

3                  On January 17, 2019 (the “B. & J. Petition Date”), B. & J. Property  
4      Investments, Inc. (“B & J,” or the “Company”) filed a voluntary petition under Chapter 11 of  
5      Title 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code (the “Bankruptcy Code”). On January 28,  
6      2019 (the “Berman Petition Date”), William J. Berman (“Berman”) filed a voluntary petition  
7      under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. B & J and Berman are together referred to as  
8      “Debtors.” On October 16, 2019, the Court entered an Order Approving Disclosure  
9      Statement (“Disclosure Statement”). The Disclosure Statement and Plan were thereafter  
10     transmitted to all Creditors and interested parties. The deadline for filing written ballots  
11     accepting or rejecting the Plan and filing objections to the Plan was December 5, 2019.  
12     Classes 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, and 9 voted 100% in favor of the Plan. Class 3 is unimpaired and  
13     deemed to have accepted the Plan. 11 U.S.C. § 1126(f). The majority of Classes 6 and 7  
14     voted in favor of the Plan, but there were not sufficient votes in favor to obtain class  
15     acceptance. No objections to the Plan were filed.

16     **II. NO OBJECTIONS TO THE PLAN WERE FILED OR SHOULD BE**  
17     **BELATEDLY CONSIDERED**

18                  Section 1128(b) of the Bankruptcy Code states that “[a] party in interest may  
19     object to confirmation of a plan.” Rule 3020(b) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy  
20     Procedure governs objections under section 1128(b). That rule provides that “[a]n objection  
21     to confirmation of the plan shall be filed and served on the debtor, the trustee, the proponent  
22     of the plan, any committee appointed under the Bankruptcy Code, and any other entity  
23     designated by the court, within a time fixed by the court” (emphasis added). Rule 3020(b)  
24     also requires that a copy of any objection brought under section 1128 must be transmitted to  
25     the U.S. trustee within the time fixed by the court for filing objections.

1 On October 16, 2019, the Court entered an order requiring that any objections  
2 to the proposed Plan “must be in writing” and “must be filed with the Clerk of Court” no  
3 later than December 5, 2019 [ECF No. 248]. The December 5, 2019, deadline to file  
4 objections has come and gone; no objections were filed. In turn, consistent with Bankruptcy  
5 Rule 3020(b) and the Court’s order, the Court should not consider any objections to the  
6 extent they are belatedly asserted. *See, e.g., In re Ruti-Sweetwater, Inc.*, 836 F.2d 1263, 1267  
7 (10th Cir. 1988) (“The Code contemplates that concerned creditors will take an active role in  
8 protecting their claims. Otherwise, Bankruptcy Rule 3020(b), which provides for fixing a  
9 deadline for filing objections to confirmation, would have no substance) (internal citations  
10 omitted); *In re Goldstein*, 114 B.R. 430 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1990) (rejecting untimely  
11 confirmation objection).

12 **III. SUMMARY OF THE PLAN**

13 **1. General**

14 Generally, the Plan provides that (a) Debtors will operate in the ordinary  
15 course and pay and satisfy their obligations from revenue generated by operations; and  
16 (b) Debtors shall seek to prevail on the appeal in the Class Action Case so they may pay all  
17 Creditors in full over time; or (c) if Debtors are unable to prevail, or at least substantially  
18 prevail on the appeal, (i) B. & J. will pursue its malpractice claim against Saalfeld Griggs and  
19 if insufficient funds are recovered, B. & J. will then seek to refinance or sell the Real  
20 Property and liquidate its assets, with the Net Proceeds to be distributed first to Secured  
21 Creditors and then pro rata to Unsecured Creditors; and (ii) Berman will distribute to  
22 unsecured creditors all the projected disposable income he believes he will receive during the  
23 five-year period after the Effective Date.

24 **2. Secured Creditors**

25 Reorganized B. & J.’s secured Creditor, Columbia Credit Union  
26 (“Columbia”), will be paid the full amount of its Allowed Secured Claim in accordance with

1 the existing terms of its loan to B. & J., except as modified under the Plan with respect to  
2 certain loan terms and covenants set forth in the Plan.

3 Reorganized Berman's secured Creditor, Quicken Loans, Inc. ("Quicken  
4 Loans"), will be paid the full amount of its Allowed Secured Claim in accordance with the  
5 existing terms of its loan to Berman.

6 **3. General Unsecured Creditors**

7 B. & J.'s General Unsecured Creditors will be paid in full over five years if  
8 other Unsecured Creditors are paid in full. However, if B. & J. does not prevail on the appeal  
9 of the Class Action Case, and there are insufficient funds to pay the Class Action Claims,  
10 then General Unsecured Creditors will be paid pro rata from the sale and liquidation of B. &  
11 J.'s assets on a pro rata basis with Unsecured Class Action Claims.

12 To the extent not paid by B. & J., Berman's General Unsecured Creditors and  
13 Class Action Creditors (discussed below) shall be paid their pro rata share of \$60,000, which  
14 is Berman's projected disposable income for the five-year period following the Effective  
15 Date.

16 **4. Class Action Creditors**

17 Certain Creditors in the Marion County Case (the "Class Action Claims")  
18 were awarded a General Judgment in the total amount of \$4,864,951 against Debtors on  
19 October 31, 2018, which Debtors have appealed. If the Class Action Claims are denied on  
20 appeal, they will receive nothing. If the Class Action Claims are allowed and prevail on  
21 appeal, then such Allowed Claims will be paid in full if B. & J. has sufficient funds to do so  
22 once the appeals have concluded, or B. & J. will liquidate its assets and pay the Class Action  
23 Creditors from available funds. B. & J. plans to file an adversary proceeding under 11 USC  
24 § 547 avoiding the judgment lien obtained by the Class Action Claimants as a bankruptcy  
25 preference. If the B. & J. preference claim is successful, the Class Action Claims will be  
26 Unsecured Claims even if Allowed. If the preference claim is not successful and the Class

1 Action plaintiffs prevail on the appeal, they would have at least a partially Secured Claim  
2 against the Real Property up to the value of the Real Property in excess of prior liens.

3 To the extent the Class Action Claims are unsecured, paid in full, and entitled  
4 to interest, they shall receive interest at the federal judgment rate. *In re Cardelucci*, 285 F.3d  
5 1231 (9th Cir. 2002) (interest is to be calculated using the federal judgment interest rate); *In*  
6 *re Beguelin*, 220 B.R. 94, 99 (9th Cir.BAP1998) (same), *In re Williams Love, O'Leary, &*

7 *Powers, PC*, 588 Fed.Appx. 559 (Mem) (9th Cir. 2014) (unpublished opinion) (same). To the  
8 extent the Allowed Class Action Creditors are unsecured, but not paid in full by B. & J., they  
9 shall receive payment from Berman in the amount of their pro rata share of \$60,000.

10 To the extent the Class Action Claims are secured, Debtors seek to modify the  
11 Plan as set forth in Section IV, below.

12 **5. Equity Interests**

13 The Plan provides that existing equity interests in B. & J. will be left in place  
14 unless the Company is liquidated, in which case equity will be extinguished.

15 The Plan provides that Berman will retain his interests in the assets of his  
16 bankruptcy estate.

17 **6. Leases and Executory Contracts**

18 All unexpired leases and executory contracts will be assumed by the  
19 respective Debtors through the Plan unless such unexpired leases and executory contracts  
20 have previously been assumed and assigned or rejected, or a motion seeking their assumption  
21 or rejection has been filed before the Confirmation Date.

22 **IV. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PLAN**

23 In accordance with 11 U.S.C. § 1127(a) and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy  
24 Procedure 3019(a), Debtors propose that modifications with respect to Class 6, as set out  
25 immediately below, be approved as part of their Plan at the confirmation hearing. . *In re Art*  
26 *and Architecture Books of the 21st Century*, 2016 WL 1118743, Case No. 2:13-bk-14135-

1 RK, at \*4 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. March 18, 2016) (The Bankruptcy Code permits plan  
2 modification at the confirmation hearing); *In re U.S. Fidelis, Inc.*, 481 B.R. 503, 524 (Bankr.  
3 E.D. Mo. 2012) (plan modification does not require additional disclosure or re-solicitation of  
4 votes where classes will not be materially and adversely impacted by modification); *In re Art*  
5 and Architecture Books of the 21st Century, Case No. 2:13-bk-14135-RK, 2016 WL  
6 1118743, at \*5 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. March 18, 2016) (where plan modifications do not change  
7 the way any creditor would vote, no further solicitation is needed). These proposed changes  
8 have no materially adverse impact on any class.

9                   Debtors propose that the first paragraph of Section 5.6 of the Plan be modified  
10 as follows:

11                   “Class 6 consists of the Allowed Class Action Claims against B. & J. of  
12 Creditors entitled to payment resulting from the Class Action Case. To the extent the Class 6  
13 Class Action Claims are partially or fully Allowed Secured Claims, they will be paid the  
14 allowed amount of their Secured Claim in full with interest, if applicable, at the prime rate of  
15 interest (fixed at the rate in effect on the Effective Date) plus 2% from and after the Effective  
16 Date, or at such other rate fixed by the Court at confirmation, until paid as described below.  
17 To the extent the Allowed Class Action Claims are Allowed Unsecured Claims or to the  
18 extent the value of any Collateral valued as of the B. & J. Petition Date is insufficient to pay  
19 Allowed Secured Claims, then the deficiency amount shall be treated as an Unsecured Claim,  
20 which Allowed Unsecured Claims of Class Action Claimants shall be paid with interest, if  
21 applicable, at the federal judgment rate (fixed at the rate in effect on the Effective Date) from  
22 and after the Effective Date until paid as described below.” The remainder of Section 5.6  
23 shall remain the same.

1      **V. THE PLAN SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENTS OF 11 U.S.C. § 1129**

2              Debtors' Plan is confirmable. Section 1129(a) of the Bankruptcy Code  
3 provides that the Court shall confirm a plan if it meets the requirements set forth therein.  
4 Debtors' Plan meets those requirements.

5      **A. THE PLAN COMPLIES WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF 11 U.S.C.**

6              **§ 1129(A)(1)**

7              Section 1129(a)(1) requires that the Plan comply with the applicable  
8 provisions of Title 11. This requirement is generally accepted to mean that the Plan must  
9 comply with the classification and other requirements of 11 U.S.C. §§ 1122 and 1123. *In re*  
10 *Art and Architecture Books of the 21st Century*, Case No. 2:13-bk-14135-RK, 2016 WL  
11 1118743, at \*14 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. March 18, 2016) (finding that the legislative history of  
12 1129(a)(1), as set out in H.R.Rep. No. 5-595, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. 412 (1977) and S.Rep.  
13 No. 95989, 95th Cong., 2d Sess. 126 (1978), explains that this provision encompasses the  
14 requirements of Sections 1122 and 1123, which are the substantive provisions most relevant  
15 in satisfying section 1129(a)); *In re Toy & Sports Warehouse, Inc.*, 37 B.R. 141, 149 (Bankr.  
16 S.D.N.Y. 1984); *In re Apex Oil Co.*, 118 B.R. 683 (Bankr. E.D. Mo. 1990). There is no  
17 dispute that the Plan complies with Section 1129(a)(1) and is consistent with 11 U.S.C.  
18 §§ 1122 and 1123.

19      **B. THE PLAN COMPLIES WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF**

20              **11 U.S.C. § 1129(A)(2)**

21              Section 1129(a)(2) requires the proponent of a Plan to comply with all  
22 applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code. The record reflects that Debtors have  
23 complied with all applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code, Bankruptcy Rules, and  
24 Local Bankruptcy Rules.

1           **C. THE PLAN IS PROPOSED IN GOOD FAITH AND COMPLIES WITH**  
2           **THE REQUIREMENTS OF 11 U.S.C. § 1129(A)(3)**

3           Section 1129(a)(3) requires that a Plan be “proposed in good faith and not by  
4           any means forbidden by law.” A Chapter 11 plan is proposed in good faith where it achieves  
5           a result consistent with the objectives and purposes of the Bankruptcy Code. *Platinum*  
6           *Capital, Inc. v. Sylmar Plaza, LP (In re Sylmar Plaza, LP)*, 314 F.3d 1070, 1074 (9th Cir.  
7           2002). In determining whether the Debtors have acted in good faith in proposing a  
8           reorganization plan, the Court must take into account the totality of the circumstances,  
9           including whether the plan deals with the creditors in a fundamentally fair manner.  
10          *Jorgensen v. Federal Land Bank (In re Jorgensen)*, 66 B.R. 104, 108-109 (9th Cir BAP  
11          1986).

12          The B. & J. Plan provides for either payment in full to all Allowed Claims or  
13          for the liquidation of the Debtor and distribution of the assets in order of priority. If Allowed  
14          Class Action Claims are not paid in full from B. & J., then they will also receive payment  
15          from Berman. The Plan is a good faith effort by Debtors to maximize the recovery to  
16          Creditors and deals with Creditors in a fundamentally fair manner and recognizes and  
17          preserves all rights of Creditors and interested parties.

18           **D. THE PLAN SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENTS OF 11 U.S.C.**

19           **§ 1129(A)(4)**

20          Section 1129(a)(4) requires that the Plan provide for appropriate court  
21          supervision over professional fees and expenses incurred in connection with the case, or in  
22          connection with the plan and incident to the case. All such fees and expenses have been or  
23          will be submitted to the Court for approval in applications to compensate professionals and,  
24          therefore, this requirement is satisfied.

1           **E. THE PLAN COMPLIES WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF 11 U.S.C.**

2           **§ 1129(A)(5)**

3           Section 1129(a)(5) requires: (1) the disclosure of the identity and affiliations  
4 of any individual proposed to serve post-confirmation as a successor to the debtors under the  
5 plan; (2) that such appointment be consistent with the interests of creditors, equity security  
6 holders, and with public policy; and (3) disclosure of the nature of the compensation to be  
7 provided to any insiders to be employed or retained post-confirmation.

8           B. & J. will continue to be operated by William Berman as President and  
9 Deborah Berman as Secretary. Their compensation is \$6,250 per month each and will be  
10 paid from the operations of B. & J. Accordingly, the disclosure requirements of  
11 Section 1129(a)(5) have been satisfied.

12           **F. 11 U.S.C. § 1129(A)(6) IS NOT APPLICABLE TO THE PLAN**

13           Debtors are not subject to any governmental regulation regarding rate changes  
14 as provided in Section 1129(a)(6). B. & J. will comply with applicable Oregon law, as  
15 recently enacted under Senate Bill 608, with respect to any rent increases.

16           **G. THE PLAN IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF CREDITORS AND**  
17           **COMPLIES WITH THE REQUIREMENTS § 1129(A)(7)**

18           Section 1129(a)(7) requires that holders of claims or interests of each  
19 impaired class either accept the Plan or "receive or retain under the Plan \* \* \* property of a  
20 value, as of the effective date of the plan, that is not less than the amount that such holder  
21 would so receive or retain if the debtors were liquidated under Chapter 7...." As set forth in  
22 the Section VIII of the Disclosure Statement and the Liquidation Analysis attached thereto as  
23 Exhibit 3, Creditors will receive or retain property of a value, as of the Effective Date, that is  
24 not less than the amount that they would receive or retain if Debtors were liquidated under  
25 Chapter 7 of this Title. 11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(7)(ii). Accordingly, the requirements of  
26 Section 1129(A)(7) have been satisfied.

1           **H. THE PLAN SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENTS OF 11 U.S.C.**

2           **§ 1129(A)(8)**

3           Section 1129(a)(8) requires that each class of claims has either accepted the  
4 Plan or such class is not impaired under the Plan. Class 3 is unimpaired, so § 1129(a)(8) is  
5 satisfied as to Class 3. Classes 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, and 9 have accepted the Plan. Thus,  
6 Section 1129(a)(8) is satisfied as to Classes Classes 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, and 9.

7           Classes 6 and 7 voted in favor of the Plan, but not in sufficient amounts to  
8 constitute class acceptance.

9           Debtors request that the Plan still be confirmed pursuant to 11 U.S.C.  
10 § 1129(b)(1). In accordance with 11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)(1), if all of the applicable  
11 requirements of § 1129(a) other than § 1229(a)(8) are met with respect to a plan, the Court  
12 shall still confirm a plan notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (a)(8) if the plan  
13 does not discriminate unfairly and is fair and equitable with respect to each class of claims or  
14 interests that is impaired and has not accepted the plan. Here, 11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(8) is still  
15 satisfied because, consistent with 11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)(1), the Plan does not discriminate  
16 unfairly and is fair and equipment with respect to all impaired classes, as discussed further  
17 below. See Section P below.

18           **I. THE PLAN SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENTS OF 11 U.S.C.**

19           **§ 1129(A)(9)**

20           Section 1129(a)(9) requires particular treatment with respect to certain priority  
21 claims except to the extent that the claimant has agreed to a different treatment.

22           Section 1129(a)(9)(A) is satisfied because Article 2 of the Plan provides that  
23 administrative expenses will be paid in full in cash on the later of the Effective Date or the  
24 date on which such claims are approved by the court, unless different treatment is agreed to.  
25 Because this Chapter 11 case was commenced voluntarily, there are no "gap" claims.

26           Section 1129(a)(9)(B) does not apply.

1                   Section 1129(a)(9)(C) and (D) is satisfied because Article 2 of the Plan  
2 provides that priority tax claims will be paid.

3                   **J. THE PLAN SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENTS OF 11 U.S.C.**

4                   **§ 1129(A)(10)**

5                   Section 1129(a)(10) requires that if a class of claims is impaired under the  
6 Plan, at least one class of claims that is impaired under the Plan has accepted the Plan,  
7 determined without including any acceptance of the Plan by any insider. Impaired Classes 1,  
8 2, 4, and 5 voted to accept the Plan; therefore, this requirement is satisfied. *In re Transwest*  
9 *Resort Properties Inc.*, 881 F.3d 724 (9th Cir. 2018) (Section 1129(a)(10) of the Bankruptcy  
10 Code, which requires cramdown plans to have at least one impaired accepting class, applies  
11 on a “per-plan” basis, rather than a “per-debtor” basis).

12                  **K. THE PLAN SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENTS OF 11 U.S.C.**

13                  **§ 1129(A)(11)**

14                  Debtors’ Plan is feasible and satisfies the requirements of  
15 Section 1129(a)(11). The “feasibility” requirement of Section 1129(a)(11) requires that in  
16 order to confirm a plan, a court must be satisfied that confirmation “is not likely to be  
17 followed by the liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtors or  
18 any successor to the debtors under the plan, unless such liquidation or reorganization is  
19 proposed in the plan.” To demonstrate that a plan is feasible, a debtor is required to show a  
20 “reasonable probability of success”; a debtor does not have to prove that success is inevitable.  
21 *In re Brotby*, 303 B.R. 177, 191 (9th Cir. BAP 2003) (*citing In re Acequia, Inc.*, 787 F.2d  
22 1352, 1364 (9th Cir. 1986)); *In re WCI Cable, Inc.*, 282 B.R. 457, 486 (Bankr. D. Or. 2002).  
23 “The mere potential for failure of the plan or the prospect of financial uncertainty is  
24 insufficient to disprove feasibility.” *In re Sagewood Manor Associates Limited Partnership*,  
25 223 B.R. 756, 762 (Bankr. D. Nev. 1998). The threshold of evidence necessary to establish  
26 feasibility is relatively low; a debtor need only establish that there is a reasonable probability

1 that the provisions of the plan of reorganization can be performed. *Brotby*, 303 B.R. at 192;  
2 *Sagewood*, 223 B.R. at 762.

3 As described above, Debtors' Plan provides that Debtors will operate in the  
4 ordinary course, pay and satisfy their obligations from revenue generated by operations, and  
5 seek to prevail on the appeal in the Class Action Case so they may pay all Creditors in full  
6 over time. In the event Debtors are unable to prevail, or at least substantially prevail on the  
7 appeal, B. & J. will pursue its malpractice claims against Saalfeld Griggs and if insufficient  
8 funds are recovered, B. & J. will then seek to refinance or sell the Real Property and liquidate  
9 its assets, with the Net Proceeds to be distributed pro rata to Creditors in order of priority;  
10 and Berman will distribute to unsecured creditors all the projected disposable income he  
11 believes he will receive during the five-year period after the Effective Date. In other words,  
12 the Plan is either a payment in full Plan or a self-effectuating Liquidation Plan.

13 As shown in the projections attached to the Disclosure Statement, Debtors  
14 have adequate operations to carry out the Plan and the projections on which they rely are  
15 realistic. If they are not successful, then the Plan calls for the liquidation of assets through a  
16 sale. Accordingly, there is more than a reasonable probability that the Debtors will be able to  
17 perform pursuant to the Plan.

18 The more relevant issue here is the application of § 1129(a)(11) to a plan of  
19 liquidation. *In re The Heritage Organization, L.L.C.*, 375 B.R. 230, 311 (Bankr. N.D. TX  
20 2007). As discussed by the court in *The Heritage Organization*, 375 B.R. at 311, some  
21 courts take a narrow approach and interpret the plain language of § 1129(a)(11) to say that  
22 feasibility need not be established when liquidation is proposed in the plan. *See, e.g., In re*  
23 *47th and Bellevue Partners*, 95 B.R. 117, 120 (Bankr.W.D.Mo. 1988); *In re Pero Bros.*  
24 *Farms, Inc.*, 90 B.R. 562, 563 (Bankr.S.D.Fla. 1988). Or, to put it differently, courts find  
25 that § 1129(a)(11) is satisfied where such liquidation is proposed in the plan. *In re Cellular*  
26 *Info. Sys., Inc.*, 171 B.R. 926 (Bankr.S.D.N.Y. 1994).

**Page 12 of 16** MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF CONFIRMATION OF DEBTORS' PLAN OF  
REORGANIZATION AND NOTICE OF PLAN MODIFICATION REJECTING  
PLAN

TONKON TORP LLP  
888 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600  
Portland, Oregon 97204

503-221-1440

1           Other courts take a broader approach and apply the feasibility test to plans of  
2 liquidation, focusing their analysis on whether the liquidation itself, as proposed in the plan,  
3 is feasible. *See, e.g., In re Holmes*, 301 B.R. 911, 914 (Bankr.M.D.Ga. 2003); *In re Yates*  
4 *Development, Inc.*, 258 B.R. 36, 42–44 (Bankr.M.D.Fla. 2000).

5           Even if the broader approach is used and the feasibility test applies to plans of  
6 liquidation, the Plan is feasible because the assets can be sold and liquidated. In fact, the  
7 value of the real estate and RV Park is likely to be much higher in the future than it is at  
8 present. Under the life of the Plan, rental rates and gross revenue will be increasing which  
9 will improve the value of the property in the event of a sale. In addition, the property  
10 currently has a significant amount of deferred maintenance. The projections include  
11 significant amounts to be used to remedy the deferred maintenance and improve the  
12 condition of the property which will also increase its value. Thus, even if the property will  
13 ultimately be liquidated, creditors will receive more from a liquidation under the Plan than if  
14 a liquidation of the property would occur now. The feasibility of the liquidation itself will  
15 not change.

16           Accordingly, there is more than a reasonable probability that the Debtors will  
17 be able to perform pursuant to the Plan. For these reasons, the Plan is feasible and satisfies  
18 the requirements of Section 1129(a)(11).

19           **L. THE PLAN SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENTS OF 11 U.S.C.**

20           **§ 1129(A)(12)**

21           Section 1129(a)(12) requires that certain fees listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1930, as  
22 determined by the Court at the hearing on confirmation of the Plan, have been paid or that the  
23 Plan provides for the payment of all such fees on the Effective Date of the Plan. Section 2.4  
24 of the Plan provides for the payment of all such fees so this requirement is satisfied.

1           **M. SECTION 1129(A)(13) DOES NOT APPLY TO THE PLAN**

2           Because Debtors offers no retiree benefits as that term is defined in  
3 Section 1114, Section 1129(a)(13) is not applicable to confirmation of the Plan.

4           **N. SECTIONS 1129(A)(14) AND (15) DO NOT APPLY TO THE PLAN**

5           B & J is not an individual and Berman individually is not obligated to pay  
6 domestic support obligations.

7           **O. SECTION 1129(A)(16) DOES NOT APPLY TO THE PLAN**

8           B. & J. is not a corporation or trust that is not a moneyed, business, or  
9 commercial corporation or trust.

10          **P. THE PLAN SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 1129(B)**

11           Section 1129(b) of the Bankruptcy Code provides a mechanism for  
12 confirmation of a chapter 11 plan in circumstances where not all impaired classes of claims  
13 and equity interests vote to accept that plan. Classes 6 and 7 did not accept the Plan.

14           The Plan satisfies the fair and equitable requirement of Section 1129(b)(2)  
15 with respect to Classes 6 and 7. Section 1129(b)(2)(A)(i) provides that with respect to a class  
16 of secured creditors, the plan must be fair and equitable by providing:

17           (I) that the holders of such claims retain the liens securing such  
18           claims, whether the property subject to such liens is retained by the  
19           debtor or transferred to another entity, to the extent of the allowed  
20           amounts of such claims; and

21           (II) that each holder of a claim of such class receive on account  
22           of such claim deferred cash payments totaling at least the allowed  
23           amount of such claim, of a value, as of the effective date of the  
24           plan, of at least the value of such holder's interest in the estate's  
25           interest in such property.

1                   Class 6 provides for the Class Action Claims to retain their security interest, to  
2 the extent their junior lien is not avoided as a preference. In addition the Class 6 Secured  
3 Claims will receive interest on account of the claim at the rate of a prime + 2%. Prime + 2%  
4 is an appropriate rate. *Till v. SCS Credit Corporation*, 541 U.S. 465, 124 S. Ct. 1951, 158  
5 L.Ed.2d 787 (2004); *In re Windmill Durango Office, LLC*, 481 B.R. 51, 59 (9th Cir BAP  
6 2012) (under Till, the appropriate rate of interest is the prime rate plus a 1% to 3%  
7 adjustment for risk factors); *In re Industry West Commerce Center LLC*, 2011 WL 3300187,  
8 Nos. BAP NC-10-1336-JuHBA, 10-10088 (9th Cir. BAP, May 24, 2011) (upholding the  
9 bankruptcy court's application of the "prime plus" approach and assessment of 1.70% risk  
10 adjustment).

11                  The "Absolute Priority Rule" will only apply in the event that all of the  
12 following occur: (1) Debtors are unsuccessful on their appeal, (2) the Class Action Claims  
13 are not fully paid by B. & J., and (3) the remainder of the Class Action Claims are not paid in  
14 full from the Berman Unsecured Claims Fund. The Absolute Priority Rule provides that  
15 unsecured creditors in a dissenting impaired class must be satisfied in full before the debtor is  
16 allowed to retain any property under the plan. In B. & J., the equity is cancelled if there are  
17 insufficient funds to pay all other creditors in full. In Berman's case, Berman proposes to  
18 retain approximately \$97,665.13 of non-exempt property. Specifically, the non-exempt  
19 portion of equity in his residence, and the amount of cash Berman held on hand and in his  
20 checking account on the Petition Date. In the event the Absolute Priority Rule applies,  
21 Berman proposes to obtain a loan from family or from a financial institution to pay the Class  
22 Action Claims the lesser of \$98,000, or the amount needed to pay the remaining balance of  
23 the Class Action Claims.

24                  ///

25                  ///

26                  ///

**Page 15 of 16    MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF CONFIRMATION OF DEBTORS' PLAN OF  
REORGANIZATION AND NOTICE OF PLAN MODIFICATION REJECTING  
PLAN**

TONKON TORP LLP  
888 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600  
Portland, Oregon 97204

503-221-1440

Case 19-60138-pcm11 Doc 273 Filed 12/11/19

## VI. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should confirm the Plan, as modified.

DATED this 11th day of December, 2019.

TONKON TORP LLP

By /s/ Timothy J. Conway

Timothy J. Conway, OSB No. 851752

Ava L. Schoen, OSB No. 044072

Attorneys for B. & J. Property Investments, Inc.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing **MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF CONFIRMATION OF DEBTOR'S PLAN OF REORGANIZATION AND NOTICE OF PLAN MODIFICATION** was served on the parties indicated as "ECF" on the attached List of Interested Parties by electronic means through the Court's Case Management/Electronic Case File system on the date set forth below.

In addition, the parties indicated as "Non-ECF" on the attached List of Interested Parties were served by mailing a copy thereof in a sealed, first-class postage prepaid envelope, addressed to each party's last-known address and depositing in the U.S. mail at Portland, Oregon on the date set forth below.

DATED this 11th day of December, 2019.

TONKON TORP LLP

By /s/ Timothy J. Conway  
Timothy J. Conway, OSB No. 851752  
Ava L. Schoen, OSB No. 044072  
Attorneys for B. & J. Property Investments, Inc.

## **CONSOLIDATED LIST OF INTERESTED PARTIES**

### ***In re B. & J. Property Investments, Inc.***

U.S. Bankruptcy Court Case No. 19-60138-pcm11

### ***In re William J. Berman***

U.S. Bankruptcy Court Case No. 19-60230-pcm11

## **ECF PARTICIPANTS**

- TIMOTHY J CONWAY tim.conway@tonkon.com, candace.duncan@tonkon.com, spencer.fisher@tonkon.com
- NICHOLAS J HENDERSON nhenderson@portlaw.com, tsexton@portlaw.com; mperry@portlaw.com; hendersonnr86571@notify.bestcase.com
- KEITH D KARNES kkarnes@keithkarnes.com, kkarnesnotices@gmail.com; patricia@keithkarnes.com; 9982680420@filings.docketbird.com; r51870@notify.bestcase.com
- SHANNON R MARTINEZ smartinez@sglaw.com, scurtis@sglaw.com
- ERICH M PAETSCH epaetsch@sglaw.com, ktate@sglaw.com
- TERESA H PEARSON teresa.pearson@millernash.com, MNGD-2823@millernash.com
- AVA L SCHOEN ava.schoen@tonkon.com, leslie.hurd@tonkon.com
- TROY SEXTON tsexton@portlaw.com, nhenderson@portlaw.com, mperry@portlaw.com, troy-sexton-4772@ecf.pacerpro.com
- TOBIAS TINGLEAF toby@shermlaw.com, darlene@shermlaw.com
- US TRUSTEE, EUGENE USTPRegion18.EG. ECF@usdoj.gov

## **NON-ECF PARTICIPANTS**

### **B. & J. TOP 20 UNSECURED CREDITORS**

Class Action Plaintiffs  
c/o Brady Mertz  
Brady Mertz PC  
345 Lincoln St.  
Salem, OR 97302

Portland General Electric  
POB 4438  
Portland, OR 97208

Judson's Plumbing  
POB12669  
Salem, OR 97330

City of Salem  
555 Liberty St. SE, Room 230  
Salem, OR 97301

Comcast Business  
POB 34744  
Seattle, WA 98124-1744

Pacific Source  
POB 7068  
Springfield, OR 97475-0068

Pacific Sanitation  
POB 17669  
Salem, OR 97305

US Bank  
POB 6352  
Fargo, ND 58125-6352

Miller Paint  
390 Lancaster Dr. NE  
Salem, OR 97301

HotSuff Spas & Pool  
1840 Lancaster Dr. NE  
Salem, OR 97305

NW Natural Gas  
POB 6017  
Portland, OR 97228-6017

Chateau Locks  
1820 47th Terrace East  
Bradenton, FL 34203-3773

Century Link  
Bankruptcy Dept.  
600 New Century Parkway  
New Century, KS 66031

Walter Nelson Company  
1270 Commercial St. NE  
Salem, OR 97301

Statesman Journal  
340 Vista Ave. SE  
Salem, OR 97302

Pacific Screening  
POB 25582  
Portland, OR 97298

DEX Media  
Dex Media Attn: Client Care  
1615 Bluff City Highway  
Bristol, TN 37620

AllAmerican Insurance  
POB 758554  
Topeka, KS 66675-8554

US Bank  
POB 6352  
Fargo, ND 58125

Susan Stoehr  
24310 S Hwy 99E, Space G  
Canby, OR 97013

Stephen Joye  
Fischer, Hayes, et al.  
3295 Triangle Dr SE #200  
Salem, OR 97302

Nancy Wolf  
2008 SE Sturdevant Rd  
Toledo, OR 97391

### **BERMAN SECURED CREDITOR**

Quicken Loans Inc.  
635 Woodward Ave.  
Detroit, MI 48226

### **BERMAN TOP 20 UNSECURED CREDITORS**

Class Action Plaintiffs  
c/o Brady Mertz  
Brady Mertz PC  
345 Lincoln St.  
Salem, OR 97302

Heather Noble  
4490 Silverton Rd NE #4  
Salem, OR 97305-2060